

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 and 17-29 are presently active in this case. Claims 1-14 and 17-18 are amended, Claims 19-29 are added, and Claims 15-16 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment. Support for the amendment can be found at least at FIGs. 3, 8, 11, and 12, and at page 15, line 17 - page 16, line 18 of the specification. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 10 was objected to due to an informality. Claim 10 is now amended to depend from Claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to Claim 10.

Claims 1-14 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ito, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,644,700, herein "Ito"). For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the art rejection.

Applicants and Applicants' representatives gratefully acknowledge the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Patricia L. Engle during the personal interview conducted on October 27, 2004. During the personal interview, proposed claim amendments were discussed in view of the art rejection. Claims 22 and 26 presented herewith correspond substantially to Claims 20 and 21 discussed during the interview with slight modification.

In the present amendment, amended Claim 1 is directed to a spoiler configured to be mounted on a bumper of a vehicle including a spoiler main body section, a plurality of mount sections, and a plurality of fixing sections integrally formed on at least one of an upper side and a lower side of the plurality of mount sections discontinuously in a longitudinal direction of the spoiler at certain intervals. The plurality of fixing sections protrudes at least one of

upward or downward from a surface of the plurality of mount sections. Claim 17 is directed to a bumper structure including a bumper spoiler with substantially similar features as those recited in Claim 1.

In non-limiting exemplary embodiments, FIGs. 8 and 11 illustrate a spoiler main body section 10, a mount section 20, and a fixing section 23 integrally formed with the mount section 20. Further, these exemplary cross-sections show the fixing section 23 protruding at least one of upwards and downwards from a surface of the mount sections.

As discussed during the personal interview, the two elastic lips 24 of Ito do not teach Applicants' plurality of fixing sections. For example, as shown in Ito's FIG. 6, the upper elastic lip 24 is taught to be a continuous structure extending along the entire length of the common mounting region 21. Further, Applicants respectfully note that the elastic lip 24 is not formed on either the first or second mounting sections 22, 23 of Ito. As described by Ito, the elastic lip 24 is provided to come into elastic contact with opposed inner wall surfaces when the common mounting section 21 is inserted into a spoiler mounting groove 1 of a bumper B (see FIGs. 3 and 5, and Col. 6, lines 12-17). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the elastic lip 24 of Ito does not teach or suggest Applicants' plurality of fixing sections integrally formed on at least one of an upper side and a lower side of the plurality of mount sections discontinuously in a longitudinal direction of the spoiler at certain intervals.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 17 based on Ito.


Further, new independent Claim 22 is directed to a spoiler including a plurality of fixing sections with a tapered section and a latch step section. New independent Claim 26 is directed to a spoiler including a plurality of first fixing sections and second fixing sections. For the reasons discussed during the personal interview, it is respectfully submitted that new independent Claims 22 and 26 are allowable over Ito.

Dependent Claims 2-14, 18-21, 23-25, and 27-29 are considered allowable for the reasons advanced for Claims 1, 17, 22, and 26 from which they ultimately depend. These claims are further considered allowable as they recite other features of the invention that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the applied reference when those features are considered within the context of independent Claims 1, 17, 22, and 26.

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

Christopher D. Ward  
Registration No. 41,367